

**MINUTES FOR THE COURT OF APPEAL  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**February 2, 2004**

DIVISION ONE

B163968      DeSantis                      (Not for Publication)  
v.  
De Witt

The judgment is affirmed. Each party to bear their own costs.

Ortega, J.

We concur: Spencer, P.J.  
Mallano, J.

DIVISION THREE

B159011 Lockheed Litigation Cases (Certified for Publication)

The judgment is affirmed. Exxon and Union Oil are entitled to costs on appeal.

Kitching, J.

We concur:   Croskey, Acting P.J.  
                  Boren, J. (Assigned)

DIVISION FOUR

B161411 People v. Phillip T. (Not for Publication)  
B169894 In re Phillip T. on Habeas Corpus

The matter is remanded with directions to the juvenile court to strike the serious felony allegation; to conduct a hearing to determine whether the ADW committed by Phillip T. was a felony or a misdemeanor; to determine the maximum period of physical confinement accordingly; and to award him predispositional credits. In all other respects, the order under review is affirmed. The petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is denied.

Curry, J.

We concur: Epstein, Acting P.J.  
Hastings, J.

DIVISION SIX

B163477 People (Not for Publication)  
v.  
Carrillo

The judgment is affirmed.

Perren, J.

We concur: Yegan, Acting P.J.  
Coffee, J.

February 2, 2004 (Continued)

## DIVISION SEVEN

B169128      People v.  
Carter

(Not for Publication)

The judgment is affirmed.

Woods, J.

We concur:   Johnson, Acting P.J.  
                      Zelon, J.

[illegible]

The judgment is affirmed.

Perluss, P.J.

We concur:   Johnson, J.  
                      Zelon, J.

## DIVISION EIGHT

B159381 People (Not for Publication)  
v.  
Thabiti

The judgment is affirmed.

Boland, J.

We concur: Cooper, P.J.  
Flier, J.

DIVISION EIGHT (Continued)

B164707      Los Angeles County, D.C.S.      (Not for Publication)

v.

Latasha Y.,

In re Corinthia Y., a Person coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.

We reverse the juvenile court's October 23, 2002, visitation order and remand this matter to that court that it may vacate its order and issue a new order which more accurately reflects the court's ruling that Latasha is allowed monitored visitation, with appropriate protections in place to address Corinthia's concerns about abduction. In addition, on remand, the juvenile court is directed to consider whether California continues to be an appropriate forum for the resolution of this matter, under the factors articulated in Family Code section 3427, subdivision (a). If the juvenile court determines California is an inconvenient forum, it shall proceed in accordance with Family Code section 3427, subdivision (c). The remaining orders under review are affirmed.

Boland, J.

We concur:    Cooper, P.J.  
                     Rubin, J.